

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document submitted January 26, 2004.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-27 are all the claims pending in the Application, as claims 13-27 are hereby added. Claims 1-12 stand rejected.

Original claims 1-12 are amended herein in an editorial, clarifying, manner. These amendments are not related to patentability, and no estoppel is intended.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

The Examiner has objected to independent claim 9 as allegedly not being directed toward patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Independent claim 9 is amended herein to clarify that it is directed to “[a] computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for performing a method.” Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jannssen et al.* (US 6,512,529; hereinafter “*Jannssen*”) in view of *DeStefano* (US 6,304,259; hereinafter “*DeStefano*”) and *Berman et al.* (US 6,448,956; hereinafter “*Berman*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 5 and 9

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner alleges that:

(1) *Jannssen* discloses “partitioning the screen” of a “display apparatus into a main display window and a plurality of contracted display windows (see Figs. 2-4) ... in a manner such that the windows do not overlap each other” (O.A., p. 3);

(2) while *Jannssen* fails to teach or suggest presenting the same “screen information on both a first contracted display window and the main display window” (O.A., p. 4), *Destefano* discloses such a relationship in FIG. 23 thereof;

(3) while both *Jannssen* and *DeStefano* fail to teach or suggest presenting the same “screen information on both a second contracted display window” and a second “display apparatus,” *Berman* discloses such a feature “by the drag and drop operation in which the image in the main image display window to be interchanged with the image in the contracted display window; column 8, lines 39-56” (O.A., p. 5); and

(4) while both *Jannssen* and *DeStefano* fail to teach or suggest presenting third screen information on both the second contracted display window and the second display apparatus “in response to an operation to the information processing apparatus.” (O.A., pp. 5-6), *Berman* discloses such a feature by “using the drag and drop function to drag display information for one window to another window in the same display or on a different display; see *Berman* column 10, lines 39-67 and column 1-25; column 15-17” (O.A., p. 6).

Applicants respectfully disagree with these allegations.

Specifically, for example, Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s allegation (1) that *Jannssen*’s “windows do not overlap each other.” In contrast, all of the Figures 2-4 cited by the Examiner show “overlapping user interface windows” 7, 10 arranged above radar data 8. Both the name of these elements (*i.e.*, “overlapping”) and the illustrations of their arrangement (*i.e.*,

over radar data 8) show that, rather than not overlapping, these windows 7, 10 are specifically designed to overlap radar data 8. Indeed, it is the entire purpose of *Jannssen* to provide these windows 7, 10, with an “invisible window feature” above radar data 8 in an overlapping fashion. In fact, if there was no such overlapping, there would be no need for the invention of *Jannssen*, *i.e.*, the “invisible window feature.” Further, with respect to the “invisible” windows shown in Figures 3 and 4, Applicants respectfully submit that, even when the windows are “invisible,” they are still arranged above radar data 8.

Additionally, Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s allegation (3) that *Berman* discloses presenting the same “screen information on both a second contracted display window” and a second “display apparatus” in column 8, lines 39-56 thereof, *i.e.*, “by the drag and drop operation in which the image in the main image display window to be interchanged with the image in the contracted display window.” This “drag and drop” operation disclosed in *Berman* (see col. 8, lines 28-48; emphasis added):

allows the user to invoke a "grabbing hand" cursor 23, as shown in FIG. 12, to perform "drag and drop" image manipulation. The "grabbing hand" cursor 23 can be used to "drag and drop" individual images in the page display mode, or stacks of images in the stack display mode. Once the cursor 20 of FIG. 4 changes form, the user may engage it with a persistent click of the left mouse button 321, and virtually pick up and move the active image, or stack of images, unto another location on the image display monitor 10.

The "drag and drop" function associated with the top border region 104 is further illustrated by the image display configuration shown in FIG. 2A. FIG. 2A shows a plurality of image display windows A through D in page display mode. The "drag and drop" function allows the image or stack of images in image display window A, for example, to be interchanged with the image or stack of images in image display window D. This feature is especially useful for grouping images or placing images side-by-side for comparison purposes.

Thus, it is clear that the “drag and drop” operation is directed to the manipulation of an image arrangement on a single display 10 (see FIG. 2A). *Berman* fails to mention any corresponding display of any of the images subject to the “drag and drop” operation on any other “display apparatus” than display 10.

Further, even when the use of multiple display monitors are disclosed by *Berman* (see FIGS. 3A-3C), these multiple display monitors display different images (*i.e.*, FIG. 3B shows images A-D on display 10A and images E-H on display 10B).

Additionally, Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s allegation (4) that *Berman* discloses presenting third screen information on both the second contracted display window and the second display apparatus “in response to an operation to the information processing apparatus” in column 10, lines 39-67 and column 1-25; column 15-17, *i.e.*, by “using the drag and drop function to drag display information for one window to another window in the same display or on a different display.”

As discussed above, the “drag and drop” feature of *Berman* only affects the images contained on one display 10. There is no teaching or suggestion that multiple displays are in any way affected by this drag and drop operation.

Thus, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fail to teach or suggest *at least* independent claim 1’s current recitations of:

(1) “partitioning the screen of a first display apparatus into a main display window and a plurality of contracted display windows in a manner such that the windows do not overlap each other,” as *Janssen* discloses overlapping windows 7, 10 in FIGS. 2-5, *DeStefano* discloses

overlapping lenses 420 and 422 in FIG. 18, and *Berman* discloses images that are all of the same size; and

(2) “presenting second screen information on both a second contracted display window of the plurality of contracted display windows and a second display apparatus,” as *Janssen* discloses only a single display 1 in FIG. 1, *DeStefano* discloses a single display 22, and *Berman* discloses the provision of different images on its displays 10A, 10B; and

(3) “changing the second contracted display window and the second display apparatus to present the third screen information thereon in response to an operation to the information processing apparatus,” as the only reference that discloses multiple displays, *Berman*, fails to teach or suggest that, if (for example) the images A-D are re-ordered in display 10A, it would have any effect on display 10B (see FIG. 3B).

Regarding independent claims 5 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 5 and 9 are patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-12 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

New Claims

Claims 13-24 are hereby added. Claims 13-24 are fully supported *at least* by Figure 2 of the instant Application. Claims 13-24 are respectfully submitted to be allowable both by virtue of their dependency, and by virtue of the features recited therein.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-27 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-27.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 28, 2005